

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON**  
**PORTLAND DIVISION**

**DON A. WEBSTER,**

Plaintiff,

No. 3:17-cv-01350-MK

v.

**ORDER**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA;  
DEWAYNE HENDRIX; ANDREW  
GRASLEY,**

Defendants.

---

AIKEN, District Judge.

This case comes before the Court on a Findings and Recommendation filed by Magistrate Judge Mustafa Kasubhai. ECF No. 55. Judge Kasubhai recommends that Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF No. 45, be granted and Plaintiff's request for leave to amend the complaint be denied.<sup>1</sup>

Under the Federal Magistrates Act, the Court may "accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). If a party files objections to a magistrate judge's findings and recommendations, "the court shall make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." *Id.*; Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff's formal Motion for Leave to File Amended Complaint, ECF No. 62, was not filed until after the F&R, but is encompassed by the F&R's recommendation.

For those portions of a magistrate judge's findings and recommendations to which neither party has objected, the Act does not prescribe any standard of review. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985) ("There is no indication that Congress, in enacting [the Act], intended to require a district judge to review a magistrate's report to which no objections are filed."). Although no review is required in the absence of objections, the Magistrates Act "does not preclude further review by the district judge[] *sua sponte* . . . under a *de novo* or any other standard." *Id.* at 154. The Advisory Committee Notes to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) recommend that "[w]hen no timely objection is filed," the court should review the recommendation for "clear error on the face of the record."

In this case, Plaintiff filed Objections to the F&R, ECF No. 61, and Defendants have filed a Response, ECF No. 64. The Court has reviewed the F&R, the Objections, Response, and the record and finds no error. The F&R, ECF No. 55, is therefore ADOPTED. Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF No. 25, is GRANTED and Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File Amended Complaint, ECF No. 62, is DENIED. Final judgment shall be entered accordingly.

It is so ORDERED and DATED this 23rd day of February 2023.

/s/Ann Aiken  
ANN AIKEN  
United States District Judge